

REMARKS

These remarks are set forth in response to the Non-Final Office Action mailed October 6, 2006. As this amendment has been timely filed within the three-month statutory period, neither an extension of time nor a fee is required. Presently, claims 1 through 17 are pending in the Patent Application. Claims 1, 4, 9, 11 and 16 are independent in nature. In the Non-Final Office Action, claims 1 through 3 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Specifically, the Examiner rightfully notes the typographical error of claim 1 in which the word "packet" inadvertently appears in place of the intended "public" as used elsewhere in the claims. In response, the Applicants have amended claim 1 to correct the typographical error.

In the Non-Final Office Action, each of claims 1 through 17 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0264673 by Novack. In response, the Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections on the art as the Applicants believe that expressly used claim language in each of the independent claims cannot be found in the identified teachings of Novack. Prior to further addressing the rejections on the art, however, a brief review of the Applicants' invention is appropriate.

The Applicants have invented a call center operably configured to retrieve a key into a customer information database from an LIDB disposed within a PSTN. In accordance with the present invention, a call center can be coupled to a gateway node between a PSTN and a data communications network. The LIDB can be disposed within the PSTN and can be configured to store a key into a customer record stored within an enterprise data driven application coupled to the call center. In this way, when an

incoming call is processed in the PSTN to connect to the call center, the key stored within the LIDB can be delivered to the call center through the gateway node with which a customer record can be retrieved for the incoming call.

Turning now to the rejections on the art, Novack teaches a telecommunications system providing a telecommunications service to a calling party. The telecommunications system of Novack includes a first intelligent peripheral configured to receive a call from a calling party. The first intelligent peripheral further can be configured to interact with the calling party and to determine whether to contact a second intelligent peripheral based on the interaction with the calling party. In this regard, the first intelligent peripheral can establish a call connection with the second intelligent peripheral so that the second intelligent peripheral can interact with the calling party or the first intelligent peripheral to provide the telecommunications service.

The plain language of Applicants claim 1 requires an "enterprise application" associated with "at least one handset" and at least one "data terminal" coupled to the "enterprise application". Claim 1 further requires a "database of caller information" that is "coupled to the enterprise application". Claim 1 yet further requires a "gateway node" that is "communicatively linked" to a "PSTN" and the "enterprise application. Finally, claim 1 requires a "query interface to the enterprise application" that has been programmed to select records in the "database of caller information" based upon "searching keys" received from a LIDB in the PSTN through the "gateway node".

The Examiner has referred to Figure 1 of Novack in support of the argument that Novack teaches each and every limitation of Applicants' claim 1. Figure 1 of Novack, however, fails to show the presence of an enterprise application excepting for

"Application Server 185". The Application Server 185, however, is not coupled to any query interface shown in Figure 1 (a feature wholly absent in Figure 1), nor is Application Server 185 associated with any handsets from a plain review of Figure 1. Notably, Application Server 185 is not coupled to the "IP Gateway 106" of Figure 1, so Applicants inquire whether the Examiner intends a different element in Figure 1 to meet the "gateway node" limitation.

Importantly, nowhere in Novack is it ever taught that a search is conducted in a database for an enterprise application using a searching key received from a LIDB in a PSTN. The Examiner argues in the Non-Final Office Action that page 3, paragraph [0035] and page 4, paragraph [0046] meet this limitation. However, a thorough review of both passages do not indicate or infer the use of a searching key found in the LIDB in searching a database in an enterprise application coupled to a terminal disposed proximately to a handset as required by Claim 1. A complete reproduction of both passages follow:

Considering first paragraph [0035] the paragraph reads,

[0035] The switching network may be an advanced intelligent network (AIN) that includes service switching points and service control points. A service switching point is connected to an individual communications device, such as a phone or modem. The service switching point responds to particular dialing patterns or sequences input to the individual communications device. The service switching point triggers when it detects a predetermined dialing pattern and sends a query via a signaling network to a service control point. The query to the service control point results in an instruction to forward the call from the service switching point to a host intelligent peripheral.

As it will be recognized by the Examiner, paragraph [0035] provides no teaching even close to querying a database for an enterprise application using a searching key retrieved from a LIDB in the PSTN.

Considering paragraph [0046] the paragraph reads,

[0046] In response to receiving the query from the switch 105 the control point 115 processes the query and transfers control to common service logic, which determines a routing solution for the call. In response to the query, the control point 115 executes its internal Called Number Identifier service logic and signals back to the inquiring switch 105 a Forward Call response with the destination routing number corresponding to the host intelligent peripheral 150. The switch 105 forwards the call to the host intelligent peripheral 150 through a switching network.

Again, paragraph [0046] provides no teaching even close to querying a database for an enterprise application using a searching key retrieved from a LIDB in the PSTN. While paragraphs [0035] and [0046] loosely relate to querying a service control point within a PSTN, there is no mention of a LIDB, searching keys in the LIDB, or the retrieval of searching keys from a LIDB to search a database of caller information for an enterprise application

Each of independent claims 4, 9, 11 and 16 require the retrieval of a searching key from a LIDB in a PSTN and using the searching key in querying a database of caller information for an enterprise application. The Examiner additionally relies upon paragraph [0062] of Novack in support of the rejections asserted for claims 4 and 11. Paragraph [0062] reads

[0062] The databases associated with the service intelligent peripheral 170 may be any database that stores information for the service intelligent peripheral 170. In an embodiment, a database associated with the service intelligent peripheral 170 may be a Public Safety database of the type used by emergency call centers, or a Line Information Database (LIDB). The database may store full textual representations of a subscriber name and address or, in the alternative, abbreviations so that data may be efficiently stored. Data corresponding to subscribers of multiple telecommunications service providers may be divided among many databases dispersed in an advanced intelligent network by any criteria, such as different telecommunications service providers, and geography.

Thus, paragraph [0062] appears to show only a generic LIDB that stores full textual representations of a subscriber name and address or, in the alternative, abbreviations so that data may be efficiently stored. Paragraph [0062] wholly fails to teach the passage of "searching keys" from the LIDB to an enterprise application for use in retrieving caller information database coupled to the enterprise application

Obviously, while some rudimentary components of an advanced intelligent network are apparent from Figure 1 of Novack and corresponding text in paragraphs [0035], [0046] and [0062], including a telephone, personal computer, database, control point, data communications network and a generic LIDB, Novack does not teach the unique combination of functionality expressed by the explicit claim language of claims 4, 9, 11 and 16--namely using a searching key retrieved from a LIDB in a PSTN to query a database of caller information coupled to an enterprise application.

To that end, the Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) and § 112, second paragraph owing to the foregoing remarks. The Applicants request that the Examiner call the undersigned if clarification is needed on any matter within this Amendment, or if the Examiner believes a telephone interview would expedite the prosecution of the subject application to completion.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of a series of loops and curves, likely representing the name Steven M. Greenberg.

Date: January 8, 2007

Steven M. Greenberg, Reg. No.: 44,725
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Carcy, Rodriguez, Greenberg & Paul, LLP
950 Peninsula Corporate Circle, Suite 3020
Boca Raton, Florida 33487
Customer No. 46322
Tel: (561) 922-3845
Fax: (561) 244-1062